

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/689,490	FLY, DAVID E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Katherine W. Mitchell	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell. (3)_____.

(2) Robert Harter. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 12 October 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: no.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative did an exceptionally clear job in illustrating, explaining and claiming patentable features of the invention, responding promptly to all of examiner's concerns, and cooperating with examiner to move the case along. This exceptional cooperation warranted allowing cancelled claims to be entered after final; thus examiner called to comment that the species subject to restriction could be rejoined, even though they had been cancelled. Examiner agreed to examiners amendment to add back the cancelled species claims that now depend on allowed generic claim 1, and offered to add back the method claims if they included the allowed fastener structure of claim 1. Also, claim 5 was changed back to its original wording. Original claims 11-14 became 25-28, and original claims 23-24 were amended to depend from claim 1 and became claims 29-30. Claims 16-22 limitations remained cancelled at applicant's request..